

REMARKS

Claims 3-22 are pending in the application. Claims 3-22 have been rejected. Claims 1 and 2 were previously canceled. Claims 3, 8, 10, 18, and 21 have been amended. Claims 7 and 9 have been canceled. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the Office Action dated December 27, 2007, are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 § 103(a):

Claims 3, 4, 7-11, 15, 16, 21 and 22 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Firouzgar*, (US Publication No. 2003/0195441) in view of *Lindner* (US Patent No.: 6,640,140) and further in view of *Yim*, (US Patent No. 6,575,802).

Claim 3 has been amended to recite, in relevant part, wherein the web browser executing on the first computer displays an **animated representation of the electromechanical device**, the animated representation mimicking the **physical operation** of the electromechanical device. The cited portion of Yim refers to "a display to support a **metaphor** for the system, such as a happy face or a sad face to indicate the simulated emotions of the device" (emphasis added). The Applicants respectfully submit that a metaphor represents a system in an abstract manner (for example, a happy face representing an operating status) is not equivalent to displaying an animated representation mimicking the **physical operation** of the electromechanical device. Therefore, the cited references do not render claim 3 unpatentable.

Claims 4, 8, 11, 15, and 16 depend from claim 3, and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 3.

Claims 7 and 9 have been canceled, obviating the rejection of these claims.

Claim 10 depends from claim 3, and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 3. Furthermore, claim 8 has been amended to recite, in relevant part, a **server** coupled to the first and second computer, the server capable of receiving the command request and transmitting the command request to the second computer over the network, the server configured to execute a **server-side software** configured to **translate** the command request received from the first computer into a wirelessly transmittable format for the second computer. Paragraph 28 of

Firouzgar does not refer to a server within the wireless system 51. Further, *Fiouzgar* does not refer to executing server-side software on the server. Therefore, the cited references do not render claim 10 unpatentable.

Claim 11 depends from claim 10, and is therefore further allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 10.

Similarly, claim 21 recites generally analogous features to claim 3. Claim 21 recites, in relevant part, applying the command by the entertainment device for the entertainment of a second user, wherein, the web browser on the first computer displaying an **animated representation of the entertainment device**, the animated representation **mimicking the physical operation** of the entertainment device. Therefore, claim 21 is allowable over the cited references for at least similar reasons as claim 3.

Claim 22 depends from claim 21, and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 21.

Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 5, 6, 12-14 and 17 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Firouzgar*, in view of *Lindner* and further in view of *Yim*, and further in view of *Polz* (US Publication No.: 2004/0260518).

Claims 5, 6, 12-14 and 17 depend from claim 3. As discussed above, the combination of *Firouzgar*, *Lindner* and *Yim* does not render claim 3 unpatentable. *Polz* has not been asserted to overcome the shortcomings of the above rejection. Therefore, the combination of *Firouzgar*, *Lindner*, *Yim*, and *Polz* does not render claims 5, 6 12-14 and 17 unpatentable. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Firouzgar* in view of *Yim*.

Claim 18 recites, recites generally analogous features to claim 3. Claim 18 recites, in relevant part, an **animated representation of the electromechanical device** is displayed on a web browser executing on the remote computer, the **animated representation mimicking the physical operation** of the electromechanical device. Thus, claim 18 is allowable over the cited references for at least similar reasons as claim 3.


Claims 19 and 20 depend from claim 18, and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 18. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-2207, under Order No. 58551-8001.US01 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Respectfully submitted,
Perkins Coie LLP

Date March 21, 2008

By 
Campbell Chiang
Registration No.: 56,518

Correspondence Address:

Customer No. 22918
Perkins Coie LLP
P.O. Box 2168
Menlo Park, California 94026
Telephone: (650) 838-4300
Facsimile: (650) 838-4350
Attorney for Applicant